A test of the argument engagement model in Romania

IOANA A. CIONEA, DALE HAMPLE, FABIO PAGLIERI

Department of Communication
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742-7635
United States
icionea@umd.edu

Department of Communication
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742-7635
United States
dhample@umd.edu

Goal-Oriented Agents Laboratory
Istituto di Scienze e Tecnologie della Cognizione
Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche
Via S. Martino della Battaglia
44, 00185 Roma
Italy
fabio.paglieri@istc.cnr.it

ABSTRACT: Hample, Paglieri, and Na's (2010) model of argument engagement proposes that people engage in arguments when they perceive the benefits of arguing to be greater than the costs of doing so. This paper tests the model in Romania, a different culture than the one in which the model was developed, by using a 2 (other arguer: friend or romantic partner) x 2 (topic of argument: private or public issue) design.

KEYWORDS: argument engagement, costs and benefits of arguing, arguing in Romania.

1. INTRODUCTION

A recent line of research (Hample, Paglieri, & Na 2010; Paglieri 2009; Paglieri & Castelfranchi 2010) has begun investigating the reasons and consequences of engaging in arguments. Our everyday interactions with others present numerous opportunities for arguing, but we don't follow up on all these possibilities. The scholars above suggest that we pick our fights based on a cost-benefit analysis. People decide to engage in an argument if the perceived benefits are greater than the perceived costs of doing so.

Hample, Paglieri, and Na (2010) proposed a model of argument engagement in which a person's intent to engage in an argument can be predicted based on situational factors (i.e., the argument topic), traits of the arguer (i.e., argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness tendencies), the expected costs of engaging in an argument (i.e., the cognitive effort involved), and the expected benefits of arguing (i.e., the perceived gains). Likelihood of winning the argument, perceived appropriateness of arguing within the given situation, the expected level of civility of the argument, the perceived resolvability of the argument, and the expected reasonability of the other person were also proposed as factors that affect one's intent to engage in an argument or not. The model proposed re-

Zenker, F. (ed.). *Argumentation: Cognition and Community. Proceedings of the 9th International Conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation* (OSSA), May 18-21, 2011. Windsor, ON (CD ROM), pp. 1-15.

ceived partial support when tested in the United States, in the context of a private, public, and workplace argumentation topic.

The purpose of this study is to test the model of argument engagement in a different culture and in a different argumentation context. Romania is a culture of convenience, but if the model is correct, it should receive support in this culture too. The argumentation context includes a private and a public topic of argument. Johnson (2002) found that people showed different levels of involvement in an argument depending on whether the topic was a private one (e.g., how to spend time together) or a public one (e.g., the death penalty). The relationship between arguers is either of friends or of romantic partners. Our main goal is to test whether behavioral intent to engage in an argument can be predicted based on the factors proposed by Hample et al. (2010): argumentativeness, verbal aggressiveness, resolvability, appropriateness, civility, other's reasonability, cost, benefits, and likelihood of winning the argument. Our secondary goal is to offer a comparison of Romanian and U.S. American argumentative and verbal aggressive traits. There are no reports about Romanians on these measures, so we take advantage of our data to extend the available knowledge about the population of our study.

2. ROMANIA: AN OVERVIEW

Romania is a country with an area of 238,391 square kilometers and approximately 22 million inhabitants, situated in Eastern Europe, neighboring Ukraine, Hungary, Serbia, Bulgaria, and Moldova (*The World Factbook* 2011). The Romanian people was formed after Roman legions conquered the ancient province of Dacia in 105-106 A.D. The Romanian language has strong Latin influences and is part of the family of romance languages (Benedict 1972).

Romanian history has been tumultuous, marked by a constant struggle to defend the territory from the expansionist tendencies of neighbors such as the Ottoman Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The current state of Romania was formed in 1918 when the provinces of Walachia, Moldova, and Transylvania united (Calafeteanu, n. d.). After War World II, Romania became a communist country. Nicolae Ceauşescu's regime brought social and moral degradation (Calafeteanu, n. d.), restricted the freedom of expression and civic involvement of citizens and isolated Romania from the Western world. In 1989 Romania overturned this political dictatorship, but the transition from the old regime proved to be very difficult. Although more than twenty years have passed since that revolution, Romania is still in a state of transition, with acute economic and political issues.

During Ceauşescu's communist regime public debate, intellectual public dialogue, and self-expression were almost non-existent. The political, social, and educational changes that occurred in post-communist Romania created a new environment for the young generation who grew up in the aftermath of the 1989 revolution. Scholars found changes in youth's system of values (Friedlmeier 2006; Săcară & Iacob 2002) and have argued youth have more individualistic orientations, guided by influences of Western cultures (Albu 2006). Eastern European adolescents (Romanians included) were found to be similar in respect to their future-orientations to American adolescents (Alsaker & Flammer 1999). In light of such conclusions, we expect that Romanian youth will exhibit a willingness to express their mind, to stand up for themselves, and defend their ideas in situations inviting arguing.

To our knowledge, there are no studies on arguing behaviors in Romania. Thus, we can speculate, at best, about the predictions of our model based on arguments made by other scholars about Romanians. We expect the cost-benefit model of argument engagement to receive support given results from studies on youth values. Săcară and Iacob (2002) found that post-communist youth valued intelligence, professional competence, and responsibility as opposed to communist youth who valued honesty, politeness, and readiness to help. The authors argued that post-communist youth was more pragmatic than communist youth. A cost-benefit analysis of a situation that invites arguing is no doubt a pragmatic assessment of one's chances in an argument. So, we can expect Romanians to adopt a pragmatic approach when arguing with others.

We believe appropriateness of arguing is an important predictor of the intent to engage in an argument among Romanians. The culture is full of social norms, customs, and rites of how one ought to behave in various relationships and situations. Deviations from appropriate behaviors tend to be ridiculed and shamed publicly (Albu 2006). Romanians are also concerned with etiquette and polite interactions. For example, there is a proper etiquette for how one ought to interact with the elderly (Benedict 1972). There are also different pronouns for the second person, singular and plural, and one must be careful about choosing the correct one in interactions (Albu 2006). We expect such considerations to be reflected in an assessment of whether arguing is appropriate within a particular situation, with a particular argumentation partner, and about a particular topic. However, in the absence of more evidence about Romanian argumentation practices, we do not have sufficient justification to formulate a strong hypothesis. We propose instead the following research question:

- RQ1: Is the behavioral intent to engage in an argument predicted by argumentativeness, verbal aggressiveness, cost of arguing, benefits of arguing, resolvability of an argument, appropriateness of arguing, civility, other's reasonability, and likelihood of winning the argument?

In addition, we are interested in differences on the variables of interest based on whether the argument is between friends or romantic partners and whether it is about a private or a public topic. As such, we propose the following research question:

- RQ2: Is there a difference in the argumentativeness, verbal aggressiveness, cost of arguing, benefits of arguing, resolvability of an argument, appropriateness of arguing, civility, other's reasonability, and likelihood of winning the argument based on a) the topic of argument or b) the argumentation partner?

Finally, a secondary goal of our study is to report information about Romanians' argumentative and verbal aggressive traits. To our knowledge, such analyses have not been conducted yet. To accomplish this goal, we compare our data from the present study with the data collected by Hample et al. (2010). The research question we seek to answer is:

- RQ3: Are there any differences between Romanians and U. S. Americans on a) argumentativeness and b) verbal aggressiveness?

3. METHOD

3.1. Participants and Sampling Methods

Participants in the study were 201 Romanians recruited in several ways. Online recruitment based on the first author's acquaintances and social networking sites yielded a sample of 61 participants. These participants completed an online version of the study. Students recruited from courses at a large university in the North-Western part of Romania yielded a sample of 58 participants. Finally, students recruited from an off-campus residence hall yielded a sample of 82 participants. Participants had various majors (e.g., economic sciences, tourism, European studies, and business) and various occupations (e.g., doctor, nurse, sales consultant, project manager, and business manager). These latter two samples completed a paper-and-pencil questionnaire, identical in content to the online one.

Participants ranged in age from 18 to 64 years (M = 23.42, SD = 5.78). Participants were undergraduate students (N = 137), graduate students (N = 22), and working adults (N = 40). One participant indicated a different occupation and another participant did not answer this demographic question. Thirty-eight participants were male and the remaining 163 were female. The ethnic distribution of participants was as follows: Romanian (N = 188), Hungarian (N = 6), Rroma (N =1), and a combination of these ethnicities (N = 4). Two participants did not indicate their ethnicity.

3.2. Procedures

A 2 (topic of argument: private or public) x 2 (relationship: friend or romantic partner) experimental design was employed in the study. Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four conditions describing a situation that invited arguing. Because not all paper-and-pencil questionnaires were returned, the number of participants within each condition was not equal. Thirty-nine participants were in the friends, private topic condition. Sixty-nine participants were in the romantic partners, private topic condition. Twenty participants were in the friends, public topic condition. Seventy-three participants were in the romantic, public topic condition. The scenarios employed are described below under *Measures.*

All participants completed demographic information and the argumentativeness (Infante & Rancer, 1982) and verbal aggressiveness (Infante & Wigley, 1986) scales. Participants then read one of the four hypothetical scenarios and answered questions about that scenario. The questions pertained to their behavioral intentions, costs, and benefits of engaging in an argument. Finally, participants assessed the realism of the scenario presented.

3.3. Argument Topics

Two of the hypothetical scenarios employed dealt with private topics and two dealt with public topics. The private topic was about preference for movies whereas the public topic was about preference for a particular political candidate. The scenarios were as follows:

Scenario I: Friends, private topic
You and a good friend of yours like movies a lot. You know a lot about various actors and don't miss a chance to go see the latest premiers. The two of you like different genres of movies. It's always been that way. One day, when you are spending some time together, your friend makes a remark about how much better the movies he/she likes are, compared to the ones you like, which are just terrible.

Scenario II: Romantic partners, private topic
You and your romantic partner (boyfriend, girlfriend, fiancé, husband, wife, etc.) like movies a lot. You know a lot about various actors and don't miss a chance to go see the latest premiers. The two of you like different genres of movies. It's always been that way. One day, when you are spending some time together, your partner makes a remark about how much better the movies he/she likes are, compared to the ones you like, which are just terrible.

Scenario III: Friends, public topic
You and a good friend of yours keep up with what's going on in the political arena and often discuss politics. Elections are in the near future and it turns out you prefer different candidates. That is not surprising as you've had different opinions and preferences about political figures in the past. One day, when you are spending some time together, your friend makes a remark about how much better the candidate he/she prefers is, compared to the one you prefer, who is just terrible.

Scenario IV: Romantic partner, public topic
You and your romantic partner (boyfriend, girlfriend, fiancé, husband, wife, etc.) keep up with what's going on in the political arena and often discuss politics. Elections are in the near future and it turns out you prefer different candidates. That is not surprising as you've had different opinions and preferences about political figures in the past. One day, when you are spending some time together, your partner makes a remark about how much better the candidate he/she prefers is, compared to the one you prefer, who is just terrible.

3.4. Measures

The measures for the variables of interest were the same as the ones used by Hample et al. (2010). A 1 to 5 Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree) was employed. The items were translated into Romanian by the first author and back-translated into English by another Romanian with excellent English language proficiency. Any disagreements were resolved by discussing the items and agreeing on a final version of the translation.

Behavioral intent was the dependent variable. Eighteen items were employed to measure whether participants intended to engage in an argument with the other person about the topic in the hypothetical scenario.

Traits of the arguer consisted of *argumentativeness* and *verbal aggressiveness*. Argumentativeness is considered a constructive trait, indicating one's tendency to attack another person's position on an issue (Rancer & Avtgis 2006). The argumentativeness scale consists of two sub-scales measuring one's tendency to approach an argument or to

avoid an argument (Infante & Rancer 1982). Both sub-scales contain ten items. Verbal aggressiveness is considered a destructive trait, indicating one's tendency to attack "the self-concepts of individuals" (Infante & Wigley 1986: 61). The verbal aggressiveness scale consists of two subscales also, indicating one's tendency for pro-social behaviors or for anti-social behaviors. Both sub-scales contain ten items.

Cost of arguing was measured with ten items assessing the cognitive effort an argument with the other person would involve. *Benefits of arguing* were measured with six items assessing the potential benefits an argument with the other person would bring, both personally, and for the relationships between the two people.

Resolvability was measured with six items assessing the chance of resolving the argument if it occurred. *Appropriateness* was measured with seven items assessing the appropriateness of having an argument with the particular person, at the particular moment, and on the particular topic. *Civility* was measured with ten items assessing the degree of hostility, open-mindedness and cooperation between the two people if an argument occurred. *Other's reasonability* was measured with six items assessing the degree to which the other person would be stubborn, mature, tolerant, and willing to change his/her mind if an argument occurred. *Likelihood of winning* was measured with eight items assessing who had better arguments and evidence to support his/her position and who the winner of the argument would be.

Finally, the *realism* of the scenarios was measured with five items assessing the degree to which each scenario presented was realistic, reflected a real-life situation, and whether participants were able to imagine themselves in the situation described in the hypothetical scenario.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Scale Assessment

Reliability analyses and inter-item correlations were examined to assess the internal structure of each scale used. These investigations were corroborated with confirmatory factor analyses (CFA). The results informed which items should be retained in each scale.

Reliability analyses produced Cronbach's alpha values. Inter-item correlations revealed any problematic and non-significant correlations. CFA models were tested using a covariance matrix of the scale items and their standard deviations as input data. The maximum likelihood method was employed to estimate each model. Model fit was assessed based on Hu and Bentler's (1999) criteria: the comparative fit index (CFI) should be greater or equal to .95, the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) should be less than or equal to .08, and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) should be less than or equal to .06. The minimum fit function chi-square and the contribution of each scale item to explain variance in the latent factor (R^2 value) were examined as well for each model. Table 1 contains the final model fit indices for each scale.

As a result of these analyses, several scales were adjusted. Four items were dropped from the scale measuring behavioral intent. Two items were dropped from the scale measuring argumentativeness, one item from each of the subscales. The verbal aggressiveness scale's 20 items were retained. Five items were dropped from the scale measuring cost of arguing. One item was dropped from the scale measuring benefits of

arguing. One item was dropped from the scale measuring resolvability. All items measuring appropriateness were retained. Five items were dropped from the scale measuring civility. Three items were dropped from the scale measuring other's reasonability. Two items were dropped from the scale measuring likelihood of winning. All items assessing the realism of the scenarios were retained.

Following these analyses, aggregate variables were computed by calculating the mean of the retained items. Table 2 contains the reliabilities, means, and standard deviations of the aggregate variables both overall, for the entire sample, and within each condition.

4.2. Regression analyses[1]

An overall regression model with dummy-coded variables was conducted. Three dummy-coded variables were used: one for the relationship between participants in the scenario (friends or romantic partners), one for the topic of argument (private or public), and one for the interaction between the dummies. Four variables predicted behavioral intent: appropriateness (β= .19, $t(185) = 3.83$, $p < .001$), civility (β= -.11, $t(185) = -1.99$, $p < .05$), other's reasonability ($\beta = .17$, $t(185) = 2.97$, $p < .005$), and likelihood of winning ($\beta = .20$, $t(185) = 3.01$, $p < .005$). The proportion of variance in behavioral intent explained by these four variables was 33% (adjusted R^2= .33, $F(15, 185) = 7.56$, $p < .001$). Thus, the structural equation for behavioral intention is BI = .19*Appropriateness - .11*Civility + .17*Other Reasonability + .20*Likelihood of Win.

4.3. Path analysis

A measured variables path analysis with the first principal component of each variable of interest was also conducted. First, we conducted a principal components analysis and retained the factor scores for the component that explained the most variance in each variable. Second, we entered these principal components along with the three dummies created in the regression analyses in a measured variables path model in which the exogenous variables were allowed to co-vary.

The path model was just-identified, so fit indices are not available. Four paths from appropriateness ($p < .001$), other reasonability ($p < .01$), likelihood of winning ($p < .001$), and the dummy for the private argument topic ($p < .05$) to behavioral intent were significant. The adjusted R^2 for the model was .36. The structural equation was BI = 0.29*DummyPrivate + 0.31*Appropriateness + 0.18*Other Reasonability + 0.21 Likelihood of Win.

In light of the regression analyses and the path analysis, we conclude as an answer to RQ1 that behavioral intent is predicted by appropriateness of arguing, other's reasonability and likelihood of winning. The dummy for the private argument topic was significant in the path model but it did not emerge as a significant predictor in the regression analyses. So whether the topic of an argument makes a difference needs further research before drawing a certain conclusion in this respect.

[1] All regression coefficients reported are unstandardized.

4.4. ANOVAs

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to assess whether any differences existed between the four conditions in respect to any of the variables in the study, given that the model posits the situation will affect one's intent to engage in an argument. Significant differences existed between groups for two variables: the avoidance dimension of argumentativeness ($F(3, 197) = 3.65$, $p < .05$) and cost of arguing ($F(3, 197) = 6.37$, $p < .001$).

Post-hoc multiple comparisons revealed that the mean of responses for argument avoidance in the romantic partners, private topic condition was significantly lower than the mean of responses for argument avoidance in the friends, private topic condition (*M difference* = -0.40, $p < .05$). The mean of responses for argument avoidance in the friends, private topic condition was significantly higher than the mean of responses for argument avoidance in the friends, public topic condition (*M difference* = 0.64, $p < .05$). Finally, the mean of responses for cost of arguing in the friends, public topic condition was significantly lower than the mean of responses for cost of arguing in the romantic partners, public topic condition (*M difference* = -0.79, $p < .005$).

Thus, the answer to RQ2a is that the topic of argument makes a difference only as far as argument avoidance is concerned (friends avoid private arguments less than they avoid public ones). The answer to RQ2b is that the argumentation partner (friend or romantic partner) makes a difference in respect to argument avoidance (friends avoid private arguments more than romantic partners do) and the cost of arguing (friends associate less costs with arguing about public topics than romantic partners do).

4.5. Romanian argumentative traits

A secondary goal of our study was to compare Romanians and U.S. Americans on argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness. We compared the data for verbal aggressiveness and argumentativeness with the data collected by Hample et al. (2010). Significant differences between Romanians and Americans were found for argumentativeness but not for verbal aggressiveness. An independent samples t-test revealed that Romanians ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 0.68$) were significantly more likely to approach arguments than Americans ($M = 3.37$, $SD = 0.57$) were, $t(317) = 2.95$, $p < .005$. Also, Romanians ($M = 2.81$, $SD = 0.78$) were significantly less likely to avoid arguments than Americans ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 0.63$) were $t(308) = 2.88$, $p < .005$. Thus, we conclude that Romanians are more argumentative than U. S. Americans are (RQ3a) and that no significant differences exist regarding verbal aggressiveness (RQ3b).

5. DISCUSSION

The present study tested the argument engagement model proposed by Hample, Paglieri, and Na (2010) in Romania, a culture different from the one in which the model was developed to assess whether the model's predictions can be applied cross-culturally. Arguing in a particular situation with a particular person and about a particular topic is a choice that people make. Other options are available, including the option to avoid the situation or the person, to refuse to engage in an argument, and to adopt some other forms of response, such as passive aggressiveness. Our investigation suggests that people's intent to engage in an argument is affected by several important factors.

The model for argument engagement posited that behavioral intent to engage in an argument is predicted by several factors: the arguer's argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness, the expected cost of arguing, the perceived benefits of arguing, the likelihood of winning the argument, the perceived appropriateness of arguing, the perceived resolvability and the expected level of civility of the argument, and the expected reasonability of the other person. This model received partial support in the present study. The regression analyses and the path model revealed that, across situations and argumentation partners, the most influential predictors of the intent to engage in an argument are the appropriateness of arguing, the perceived likelihood of winning the argument, and the expected reasonability of the other person.

As previously explained, we expected appropriateness to be an important factor that affects one's decision to engage in an argument in Romania due to the cultural norms that guide appropriate interactions with others. Paglieri (2009) explained that argumentation may be culturally encouraged or discouraged across different contexts. As such, cultural differences in perceived appropriateness of arguing are likely to exist, with some cultures sanctioning arguing as more appropriate than other cultures do. Our data suggest that in Romania's case weighing the appropriateness of arguing matters a lot.

The perceived likelihood of winning an argument as a predictor of the intention to engage in an argument suggests that people assess their chances of coming out of such an encounter victorious. As Hample et al. (2010) explained, winning may carry both an instrumental goal and a positive feeling. People may evaluate their chance of winning also in order to decide which arguments are worth pursuing. In other words, as Paglieri (2009) put it, we "pick our fights." If one perceives there is not a chance of winning, even if arguing may seem appropriate, it won't be pursued.

The expected reasonability of the other person also matters when deciding whether to engage in an argument or not. In our study, the more reasonable the other person was expected to be, the higher the chance that one would engage in an argument. This finding suggests that when the other person is perceived to not be reasonable, people are likely to decide against arguing because they deem the cause as lost. There is no point in trying to argue with someone who will not change one's mind despite good arguments and evidence.

In addition to these three factors, the significant path result from the dummy for the private argument topic to behavioral intent deserves further investigation. In our study, this path suggests that private topics are likely to determine argument engagement. This result is consistent with Johnson's (2002) findings that people were more engaged in arguments that concerned private topics than in arguments that concerned public topics. Moreover, the post-hoc comparisons suggest romantic partners are significantly less avoidant of discussing private topics than friends are. This may be the case due to the different nature of the two relationships. Romantic relationships involve a process of accommodation in which the two partners negotiate their relationship, including their stance on issues such as personal preferences. Arguments on these topics reveal information about the other person and may be necessary to develop a functional relationship. Friendships, however, do not require agreement on such issues for their continuation. In fact, according to the post-hoc comparisons, friends avoid arguing about private issues significantly more than about public issues. Public topics arguments can be perceived as friendly exchanges whereas private topics arguments may be interpreted as personal attacks or criticisms that could damage the relationship.

The fact that civility was a significant predictor of the intent to engage in an argument in the regression equation needs further attention as well. The fact that the expected level of civility may contribute to one's intent to engage in an argument makes sense, but the negative coefficient in this equation is puzzling. In other words, we find it puzzling that Romanians were more likely to engage in an argument when they expected a lower level of civility of the argument. A possible interpretation of this finding is that if people go through the trouble of starting an argument, then they want to hash it all out, including yell at the other person, and are ready for the argument to involve lack of tolerance and negativity. Beyond this speculation, however, it is clear that more research is needed to understand how Romanians approach such arguments and what their expectations about the civility of an argument are.

The results of our study did not offer any support for the personal traits of an arguer as factors that affect one's decision to engage in an argument. Nor were the perceived costs and benefits predictors of this decision. These results are consistent though in large proportion with Hample et al.'s (2010) model in which appropriateness of arguing and likelihood of winning were the two predictors of the intent to engage in all three conditions. However, unlike the Hample et al. (2010) study, the proportion of explained variance in the intent to engage based on these predictors was smaller. One possible explanation may be the difference in sample sizes, as our study had a much lower sample size and contained individuals from a different culture. The R^2statistic is sample specific (Hanushek & Jackson 1977). A second possible explanation is that our model leaves out important variables that affect one's decision to engage in an argument in Romania, given that the residual error variance in the path model was significant ($p < .001$). Therefore, a more thorough investigation of culturally specific factors is needed.

Finally, as the population of our study was Romanian, we draw a few conclusions about arguing behaviors in Romania. Our results indicate that Romanians are more argumentative than U. S. Americans are. Previous studies that have compared individuals from different cultures on argumentative and verbal aggressive traits have explained their results based on the individualism-collectivism dimension (Bresnahan, Shearman, Lee, Ohashi, & Mosher 2002; Prunty, Klopf, & Ishii 1990, 1991). According to this dimension, Romanians are more collectivistic than U.S. Americans are (Hofstede 2001). Our finding contradicts the conclusion that people from collectivistic cultures are less argumentative than people from individualistic cultures. A possible explanation is that the orientation towards individualism and collectivism among Romanians has changed from the time Hofstede's research was conducted. This explanation is supported by Albu's (2006) conclusions that Romanian youth has become more individualistic. Another possible explanation is that arguing has a different role among Romanians than among Americans. This idea needs further research, especially from an emic perspective, on the functions of argument in Romania.

5.4. Limitations and directions for future research

The present study has several limitations that must be taken into account. First, hypothetical scenarios were used rather than having participants engage in an actual interaction. The perceived realism of the scenarios, however, gives us assurance that participants believed the situations described were realistic and could put themselves in those situations

because the mean scores for all scenarios are above the scales' mean. Second, the sample in our study was mostly female. As such, the results of the study may be better interpreted as reflecting females' perspectives on the decision to engage in arguments. Third, the return rate for our paper questionnaires resulted in a disproportionate sample size for the friends conditions as compared to the romantic partners conditions, which affected the data analyses we were able to conduct. Finally, the reliability of our measures was problematic in two instances. Some of these issues may have been caused by translation inaccuracies whereas others may be reflective of problems with our scales whose validity and dimensionality should be further assessed.

The results of the present study have implications for the study of argument engagement and for the study of arguing behaviors in Romania. Our results suggest that the argument engagement model can be helpful in predicting people's intent to engage in an argument in various situations and with various people, but that the factors hypothesized to affect this intent may need revision. More studies are needed to refine this model in respect to the variables believes to affect the behavioral intent to engage in an argument and in respect to the scales used to measure these variables. The results also suggest that the model can be used across cultures. Cross-cultural tests of the model should pay careful attention to the translation of the materials in the native language and should supplement the core measures with culturally specific measures that can capture the peculiar mechanisms involved in arguing in a specific culture. Finally, our study indicates that Romanians are more argumentative than U. S. Americans are, which calls for more attention to the specific understanding of arguing, its functions, and consequences in Romanian society.

REFERENCES

Alasker, F.D., and Flammer, A. (1999). Cross-national research in adolescent psychology: The Euronet project. In Alasker, F.D. & Flammer, A. (eds). *The adolescent experience: European and American adolescents in the 1990s* (pp. 1-14). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Albu, M. (2006). Aspects regarding Hofstede's cultural dimensions model. *Buletinul Universităţii Petrol-Gaze din Ploieşti[The Bulletin of the Petrol-Gas University in Ploieşti], LVIII,* 77-82. Retrieved from http://www.upg-bulletin-se.ro/archive/2006-4/10.%20Albu.pdf

Benedict, R. (1972). Rumanian culture and behavior. *Occasional Papers in Anthropology* 1*,* 1-54.

Bresnahan, M.J., Shearman, S.M., Lee, S.Y., Ohashi, R., and Mosher, D. (2002). Personal and cultural differences in responding to criticisms in three countries. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 5, 93-105.

Central Intelligence Agency (2011). *The World Factbook: Romania.* Retrieved from https://www.cia.gov/ library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/ro.html

Calafeteanu, I. (n. d.). Istoria românilor [Romanians' history]. Retrieved from http://www.casaromana.org/ istoria/r_secolulxx.html

Friedlmeier, M. (2006). *Transmission of values within families in Romania* (Doctoral dissertation, Konstanz University, Germany). Retrieved from http://www.ub.uni-konstanz.de/kops/volltexte/2008/5505/pdf/Diss_Friedlmeier.pdf

Hample, D. (2009). Commentary on: F. Paglieri's "Ruinous arguments: Escalation of disagreement and the dangers of arguing." In J. Ritola (ed.). *Argument cultures: Proceedings of the 8th International Conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation.* Windsor, Canada: University of Windsor. [CD-ROM]

Hample, D. (2005). *Arguing: Exchanging reasons face to face*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hample, D., Paglieri, F., and Na, L. (in press). The costs and benefits of arguing: Predicting the decision whether to engage or not. In F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, D. Godden, & Mitchell, G. (eds). *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Sic-Sat.

Hanushek, E.A., & Jackson, J.E. (1977). *Statistical methods for social scientists*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Cultures' consequences* (2nd ed). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hu, L., and Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling* 6*,* 1-55.

Infante, D.A., and Rancer, A.S. (1982). A conceptualization and measure of argumentativeness. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 46, 72-80.

Infante, D.A., and Wigley, C.J. (1986). Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and measure. *Communication Monographs* 53*,* 61-69.

Johnson, A.J. (2002). Beliefs about arguing: A comparison of public issue and personal issue arguments. *Communication Reports* 15, 99-112.

Paglieri, F. (2009). Ruinous arguments: Escalation of disagreement and the dangers of arguing. In: Ritola, J. (ed.), Argument cultures: Proceedings of the 8th International Conference of the Ontario Society for the Study of Argumentation. Windsor, Canada: University of Windsor. [CD-ROM]

Paglieri, F., and Castelfranchi, C. (2010). Why argue? Towards a cost-benefit analysis of argumentation. *Argument & Computation* 1*,* 71-91.

Prunty, A.M., Klopf, D.W., & Ishii, S. (1990). Japanese and American tendencies to argue. *Psychological Reports* 66*,* 802. Retrieved from http://www.ammonsscientific.com/AmSci/

Prunty, A.M., Klopf, D.W., & Ishii, S. (1991). Argumentativeness: Japanese and American tendencies to approach and avoid conflict. *Communication Research Reports* 7*,* 75-79.

Rancer, A.S., and Avtgis, T.A. (2006). *Argumentative and aggressive communication: Theory, research, and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Săcară, L., and Iacob, L. (2002). Dinamica structurilor axiologice la adolescenţi [The dynamic of axiological structures in adolescents]. *Psihologie Socială* 10, 52-77.

Table 1
Confirmatory factor analyses results

	χ^2	*df, N*	*CFI*	*SRMR*	*RMSEA*
Behavioral Intent	204.40	77, 201	.94	.07	.09
Argt. Approach	103.22	27, 201	.92	.07	.11
Argt. Avoid	63.09*	27, 201	.97	.07	.08
Verbal agress. Pro-Social	64.90*	35, 201	.93	.06	.07
Verbal agress. Anti-Social	78.77	35, 201	.94	.06	.08
Costs	51.33	5, 201	.92	.08	.22
Benefits	34.38	5, 201	.97	.03	.15
Resolvability	25.58*	5, 201	.93	.06	.14
Appropriateness	103.77	14, 201	.93	.10	.17
Civility	30.97	5, 201	.94	.07	.16
Other Reasonability***	0	-	-	-	-
Likelihood of Win	87.45	9, 201	.86	.08	.21
Realism	14.70*	5, 201	.97	.04	.10

All χ^2 results are significant at $p = .00$ unless otherwise noted.
* $p < .001$.
** $p < .05$.
*** The model was just-identified. Therefore, no fit indices are available.

Table 2
*Descriptive Statistics for Aggregate Variables**

	α	*N*	*Mean*	*SD*
Argt. Approach	.84	201	3.53	0.68
Argt. Avoid	.85	201	2.81	0.74
Verbal agress. Pro-Social	.73	201	3.41	0.55
Verbal agress. Anti-Social	.79	201	2.64	0.63
Behavioral Intent	.87	201	3.71	0.63
Friends, public	.80	20	3.66	0.61
Friends, private	.91	39	3.82	0.67
Romantic, public	.86	73	3.57	0.64
Romantic, private	.85	69	3.80	0.60
Resolvability	.75	201	3.25	0.71
Friends, public	.57	20	3.07	0.67
Friends, private	.76	39	3.29	0.65
Romantic, public	.79	73	3.16	0.78
Romantic, private	.74	69	3.39	0.68
Civility	.82	201	3.28	0.83
Friends, public	.85	20	3.12	0.89
Friends, private	.84	39	3.28	0.82
Romantic, public	.78	73	3.30	0.76
Romantic, private	.83	69	3.30	0.90
Appropriateness	.90	201	3.02	0.92
Friends, public	.88	20	2.86	0.90
Friends, private	.91	39	3.27	0.93
Romantic, public	.87	73	2.89	0.84
Romantic, private	.91	69	3.06	0.99
Benefits	.90	201	3.16	0.85
Friends, public	.84	20	3.07	0.92
Friends, private	.86	39	3.15	0.83
Romantic, public	.91	73	3.04	0.78
Romantic, private	.93	69	3.33	0.91
Costs	.84	201	2.60	0.87
Friends, public	.74	20	3.17	0.78
Friends, private	.70	39	2.88	0.77
Romantic, public	.86	73	2.38	0.83
Romantic, private	.87	69	2.51	0.90

	α	*N*	*Mean*	*SD*
Other Reasonability	.64	201	3.23	0.73
Friends, public	.74	20	2.95	0.79
Friends, private	.31	39	3.18	0.53
Romantic, public	.65	73	3.22	0.75
Romantic, private	.74	69	3.35	0.76
Likelihood of Win	.81	201	3.10	0.62
Friends, public	.67	20	3.23	0.53
Friends, private	.51	39	2.91	0.42
Romantic, public	.82	73	3.12	0.65
Romantic, private	.90	69	3.16	0.69
Realism	.77	201	3.66	0.68
Friends, public	.67	20	3.89	0.63
Friends, private	.75	39	3.55	0.63
Romantic, public	.80	73	3.65	0.74
Romantic, private	.81	69	3.67	0.65

* All information is based on the items retained following the scale assessment analyses.